

KING COUNTY SOLID WASTE ADVISORY COMMITTEE
September 15, 2006

Unapproved Draft Meeting Notes

Members in Attendance

Carolyn Armanini
Bill Beck
Don Freas
Steve Goldstein
Jerry Hardebeck
Joan McGilton
Max Pope
Relaena Sindelar
Judy Stenberg
Joe Tessier

Others in Attendance

Gemma Alexander
Mark Buscher
Gordon Clemens
Jeff Gaisford
Jane Gateley
Theresa Jennings
Josh Marx
Brian Pahlow
Bill Reed
Alexander Rist
Diane Yates

Action Items

Lines 6-7: Approval of August minutes.

Lines 62-80: Conditional approval of Draft Transfer and Waste Export System Plan, pending third party review results.

Call to Order and Introductions

Chair Carolyn Armanini called the meeting to order at 9:40 am.

Everyone in attendance introduced themselves.

Approval of Minutes

SWAC member Joan McGilton moved approval of the August minutes.

The motion passed unanimously.

SWD Update

Division Director Theresa Jennings reported that the division gave presentations to the Regional Policy Committee (RPC) and the Growth Management and Natural Resources Committee on the Draft Transfer and Waste Export Plan and on preliminary recycling issues for the Comprehensive Plan update. The committees had very few questions on the export plan, having been well prepared for its contents in previous briefings. They were very interested in recycling issues and had many questions.

17 At its last meeting, MSWMAC unanimously passed a motion to conditionally approve
18 the Transfer and Waste Export Plan pending the results of the third party review. Council
19 is currently reviewing a draft RFP for the third party review. SWAC's questions are
20 included in the RFP.

21
22 Jennings reported that First NE reconstruction is proceeding slightly ahead of schedule.
23 Pile driving is about halfway completed and there have been very few complaints so far.
24 She said that there was a public meeting last night at the Tukwila Community Center as
25 part of the SEPA process for the Bow Lake Transfer Station Master Facilities Plan. The
26 meeting was not well attended by the public.

27
28 **MSWMAC Update**

29 SWAC Staff Liaison Diane Yates said that MSWMAC conditionally approved the Draft
30 Transfer and Waste Export System Plan last Friday, pending results of the third party
31 review. Helen Spiegelman from the Product Policy Institute gave a presentation on
32 product stewardship. These two items ran late, and MSWMAC did not finish its agenda.

33
34 **SWAC Membership**

35 Armanini said that SWAC terms run through September, and that one longstanding
36 SWAC member's term ends this year. She said this is the last SWAC meeting for Steve
37 Goldstein. Armanini presented Goldstein with a certificate of appreciation for his service
38 to SWAC from 2001-2006. Armanini personally thanked Goldstein for his contributions
39 on the First NE reconstruction project and for providing input on Snohomish County's
40 approach to solid waste. She said that his legacy will be keeping an eye on what's behind
41 recycling, looking at the costs of recycling and the natural resource tradeoffs, rather than
42 blindly supporting any recycling effort.

43
44 SWAC member Bill Beck said that he interviewed Goldstein for SWAC in 2001 and his
45 thought at that time was that if he had to resign from SWAC to make room for Goldstein,
46 he would have done so.

Jennings said she appreciates that Goldstein always brought a different perspective to SWAC.

Vice Chair Jerry Hardebeck asked if Goldstein could be persuaded to continue on SWAC.

Goldstein thanked everyone for their comments and said that he feels good for having made a contribution, and that his experience on King County SWAC has helped him become a better staffer for Snohomish County SWAC. He said he is looking forward to spending time on broader issues in Shoreline.

Draft Transfer & Waste Export System Plan; Business Plan

Armanini said that today is SWAC's last opportunity to discuss and take action on the Transfer and Waste Export Plan.

SWAC member Joe Tessier moved conditional approval of the Draft Transfer and Waste Export System Plan, pending results of the third party review.

SWAC member Bill Beck said that he intends to vote no because the plan calls for closure of Renton Transfer Station without providing additional self haul capacity elsewhere in that service area. He said that this is an unacceptable reduction in the level of service provided.

Lead Planner Mark Buscher said that the division has Beck's comment and is aware of the issue. He said the Transfer and Waste Export System Plan focuses on urban service levels, and that the Comp Plan update will address rural service levels. He added that from a timing standpoint, Renton would not close until after all other improvements in the transfer system had been implemented. This means that there would be no change in level of service at Renton for ten or more years.

SWAC member Max Pope commented that there is a concern of increased illegal dumping if self haul service is eliminated.

The motion passed 8:1, with Beck opposing.

Disposal Forecast & and Recycling Model Presentation

Division staff Alexander Rist and Bill Reed gave a presentation on the disposal forecast and recycling model used by the division, which is available at:

<http://www.metrokc.gov/extranet/dnrp/swd/SWACforecastingfinal.ppt>

Beck asked if it would be possible for recycling customers at the transfer stations to pass the scalehouse twice in order to weigh recyclables.

Jennings said that the recycling processors weigh the materials they take from the transfer stations, so that data is complete. Only a very small amount of recycling comes to the stations. The real issue is processor tonnage, where data is often proprietary.

Armanini commented that regardless of whether 43% or 62% is chosen for use as the recycling rate, a false impression is created. They are equally valid numbers, but each tells only part of the story.

Hardebeck asked about topsoil. Reed said it is one of the items on the Department of Ecology list of recycled materials, but he is not sure what it includes. Goldstein said that often subsoil is mixed with compost and sold as topsoil to be used as a manufactured planting medium.

Jennings referred back to the multicolored handout, in which numbers for items above the gray line are provided by the state, while items below the gray line often have less reliable data. She asked whether any of the items below the gray line should be included in the recycling rate.

Goldstein said there has been recycling since long before there were government programs, and it was called salvage. Not to acknowledge that recycling takes place outside of the municipal solid waste system is to give government credit for all recycling.

Reed said that it is possible to use both recycling numbers, and that it may be simply a matter of emphasis.

Jennings said that areas such as California are lauded for their recycling rates, but since more materials are included in their recycling rate, the numbers do not provide a direct comparison between regions. There may not be a lot of difference in actual amount of recycling between California and King County.

Buscher said that California has recycling mandates with financial repercussions. He said it could be argued that approach encourages more creative computations than creative recycling programs.

Hardebeck said that construction and demolition waste used to be landfilled, so it makes sense to include it in the recycling rate. Car bodies and topsoil have never been part of the waste stream, so they shouldn't count toward the recycling rate now. The same could be said of asphalt and concrete.

Armanini said SWAC had talked about whether goals should be presented in per capita or percentage formats, and commented that the result of this discussion may be to steer the group towards a per capita goal.

Division staff commented that the benefit of the percentage recycling rate is its marketability. It is easy to communicate in a five second sound bite. However, most people do not realize that it does not provide a direct comparison of the effectiveness of different recycling programs. The benefit of the per capita rate is that it is more easily measured and more useful in informing program development. It may not be necessary to choose between them.

140

141 Hardebeck said that the number of pounds of waste disposed per week per residential
142 customer is a good indicator number that satisfies elected officials.

143

144 SWAC member Relaena Sindelar asked what counts as waste.

145

146 Reed said that waste is counted once it is collected and becomes part of a system.

147 Buscher added that a junk car, for example, would be picked up by an auto wrecker, who
148 either salvages or junks the car. It never enters the municipal solid waste system.

149

150 Goldstein said that the reason for recycling used to be to preserve landfill capacity. Now
151 the reason is to conserve natural resources and protect environmental quality. If car
152 bodies have always been recycled, counting them in the recycling rate now does not
153 improve how we achieve the goals of recycling. He said we always have to return to the
154 reason for recycling.

155

156 Armanini agreed, citing the food waste recycling program in Lake Forest Park, which
157 will add to the city's fuel consumption, greenhouse gas production, traffic and safety
158 issues, but no one has questioned whether the benefit of recycling food waste justifies
159 these costs. Armanini said the solid waste industry has matured to the point where it is
160 appropriate to do this sort of complex analysis.

161

162 Buscher said that the Comp Plan kickoff meeting in June presented the idea of the triple
163 bottom line. As the plan is developed, different aspects of the system will be measured
164 against the triple bottom line.

165

166 Goldstein said that earlier he dismissed the issue of landfill capacity as a reason to
167 recycle, but the exception is here in King County because the longer Cedar Hills remains
168 open, the better it will be for the ratepayer.

169

Reed said another question is whether fuel production, for example, burning wood waste as hog fuel, should be classified as recycling.

Comp Plan Schedule

Buscher presented a proposed process for development of the Comp Plan, available here: http://www.metrokc.gov/extranet/dnrp/swd/SWAC_9-15-06.ppt

Buscher said that if everyone approves of the process identified, major issues can be scoped out for discussion. Today's meeting has already identified the issue of transfer station level of service in the rural areas. He asked if there were any other issues to add to the list, adding that this question will be on SWAC's agenda next month.

Buscher said that the recommendation to pursue early export represents a change from the previous Comp Plan, as is the recommendation to replace the Houghton and Algona Transfer Stations instead of rebuilding them onsite. In response to a question, he said the questions related to self-haul service are essentially unchanged from the previous Comp Plan.

McGilton commented that as topics are introduced it will be helpful for the division to identify which are divergent from the previous plan, and which are consistent with it.

Open Forum

Armanini said there are copies of an article in the Shoreline paper which includes a picture of Rod Hansen. It is an article on men who knit, which proves that there is life after solid waste.

The meeting adjourned at 11:30

Submitted by:

Gemma Alexander, SWD Staff